DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 039 849 HE 001 577

AUTHOR Steiger, William A.
TITLE The Integrity and Credibility of Higher Education on the Part of Students, Faculty, and Administrators.
INSTITUTION American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 2 Mar 70
NOTE 8p.; Paper presented at the 25th national conference of the American Association for Higher Education, Chicago, Illinois, March 2, 1970

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.50
DESCRIPTORS Activism, *Federal Aid, *Federal Programs, *Financial Policy, *Financial Support, *Higher Education, State Aid

ABSTRACT

Students are questioning the US system of higher education for many reasons: inadequate communication among all elements of the university, unresponsiveness to student demands, hypocrisy, lack of relevance to the world outside, and over-reaction to student protest. Efforts by administrators and faculty to meet some of the students' demands may account for the lessening of violence on campus. Responsibility for orderly progress does not lie with the students alone; Congress has to bear much of it. The federal government has assumed an important share of higher education costs, and many congressmen feel that some strings should be attached to this aid. Expenditures for higher education will be subject to increasing questioning in the years to come. Decisions will have to be made about the relative emphasis to be given to student aid and institutional aid, and whether, in the latter case, the formula grant approach or the categorical grant system should be used. Questions of raising tuition at state schools to approximate more closely the full costs of tuition and the distribution of state grants based on need must also be considered. The issue of higher education for all must be reconsidered, and the roles of community colleges and vocational education reexamined. (AF)

Group 6
Monday Morning, March 2

THE INTEGRITY AND CREDIBILITY OF HIGHER EDUCATION ON THE PART OF STUDENTS, FACULTY, AND ADMINISTRATORS*

The Honorable William A. Steiger
Member, Education and Labor Committee
United States House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

Norman Cousins wrote in the "Saturday Review,"

> The significant thing about many of today's young people in not that they are in revolt but that they are in search of workable guidelines for their lives, their work, and their relationships. Their break with the university and with their society in general has less to do with the delcared philosophy of the university and the society than with the caricaturing of that same philosophy by those who profess to venerate it.... They are hypocrisy-spotters. They are less impressed with resounding aims than with direct acts of unquestionable integrity.

His thoughts are apt and perceptive. The turmoil on our campuses on these past few years makes it imperative that we take a searching look at our institutions of l-arning. The integrity and credibility of these institutions today are under attack by a substantial number of intelligent, concerned and perplexed young people.

Let me briefly share with you some of the concerns which students expressed when I and a number of other Congressmen visited campuses of all types and sizes scattered throughout the U.S. last year. In the report, we stated that: We came away from our campus tour both alarmed and encouraged. We were alarmed to discover that this problem is far deeper and far more urgent than most realize, and that it goes far beyond the efforts of organized revolutionaries.

You may recall that at that time tensions were running high. In the midst of this campus tension, we were struck by alternate moods of great concern and a peculiar sense of assurance that somethinf for the best was growing out of it. A poet of past generations described this duality when he said, "Things fall apart--the center cannot hold." "The best lack all conviction, while the worst are full of passionate intensity." In another poem he suggests a sense of possible growth and meaning from such turmoil. "A terrible beauty is born."

Tensions are lower now and it may be possible to look at our campus report with some detachment. But the concerns expressed remain.

On campus after campus, students expressed the view that adequate channels of communication with the faculty, administration, and governing boards are lacking. Even those channels which do exist often seem remote from the policy-making power of the university. Perhaps most cirtical of all is the gap which exists between the

*Paper presented to Discussion Group 6 at the 25th National Conference on Higher Education, sponsored by the American Association for Higher Education, Chicago, Monday, March 2, 1970. Permission to quote restricted.

student and his professor, the one individual who should be most aware of and responsive to the concerns of those he teaches. A professor's non-teaching activities, such as consulting work for the government or private industry, researching, and publishing -- no matter how worthwhile -- do contribute to the student's sense of isolation and frustration.

Complaints about inadequate channels of communication often were linked with charges that those in power were unresponsive to student demands. The frequent failure of administrators and teachers to agree on how to react and the consequent inability of the university quickly to initiate and administer changes often resulted in radicalizing many moderate students.

Perhaps the single most emotional issue we noted was the one involving problems of the non-white students on an essentially white campus. For all concerned, the problems will remain. Black studies and related issues are easily translated into focal points of confrontation. And those who are in charge of institutions cannot dismiss the role of higher education in meeting what black students perceive as their needs.

A further complaint voiced by many students was that the university is a bastion of hypocrisy which fails to practice what it preaches. Students charge that the discrepancy between what the university says and what the university actually does is enormous.

Replying to the university's often expressed concern for social problems in the community, students point to university expansion into ghetto neighborhoods through programs students call "urban removal."

They charge that academic freedom is a myth when the university's purpose and direction is "subverted" by massive infusion of funds for military and industrial research. In response to the effort to educate the disadvantaged, students charge that too few are admitted and that those admitted find the institution unresponsive to individual needs and problems.

We found as this point suggests that underlying all specific issues is a fundamental dispute about the structure of the university and its role in society. There is a vast gulf between the view of faculty and administrators that the university must be a neutral institution devoted to objective truth and student ideas that the university must be committed to an active role in society. Today's student may be hard-pressed to define what he means when he says the university must be relevant to our era and its problems. Nonetheless, what is significant is that he is no longer prepared to accept without question the view that the university is an isolated tower of knowledge. Rather, as one student has put it, "The university ought to be a partisan of progressive forces in society." Thus, today's student asks such questions as "What is a university? How should the university be related to the community which surrounds it? Does higher education have to be radically altered to prepare graduates to deal with society's problems? Does course work as presently conceived relate to these problems?"

To sum up, then, such factors as viewed by students as inadequate communication among all elements of the university, unresponsiveness to student demands, hypocrisy, lack of relevance to the world outside and over-reaction to protests have caused students to question the American system of higher education. And we should not

delude ourselves into thinking that faith will be easily restored. Nor should we assume that the relative calm which has prevailed this academic year is a harbinger of a return to the years of silent acquiescence. It is a painful fact for many people, but forrthe foreseeable future student dissent is here to stay. What we must learn to do is use that productive tension contained in the best of student dissent to make creative and effective changes.

> One reason today's newspapers carry fewer grim tales of violence and unrest on our campuses is that we have learned a lesson from the past. While many universities admittedly were unprepared for the first round of disruption, this is no longer the case. Colleges and universities throughout the country have now designed specific procedures and policies to protect their campuses and to guarantee the rights of those engaged in normal university activities to continue their pursuit unhampered. At the same time, the institutions have moved to safequard and preserve the traditional, critical rights of dissent and peaceful protest so fundamental to academic freedom. Most important universities and colleges have been making diligent efforts to deal with legitimate student grievances, and to involve students more deeply in campus governance.

Such constructive effort on the part of many universities has in some cases signalled the end of destruction and beginning of dialogue. Even should the prospect of violence continue to diminish, however, creative leadership is needed to prevent our educational system from slowly settling further into obsolescence. We in this country have a very large investment in both institutions and the students who attend those institutions. Education has become the largest community expenditure in the American economy. Obviously, then, there must be a continuing concern on the part of those charged with the responsibility for governance of the campus and in legislative halls to assess carefully what we do.

Robert Frost once said, "I go to school to age to learn the past; I go to school to youth to learn the future." And so must we all.

Going to school to youth, however, does not mean granting carte blanche to youth.

Peter Drucker in his thought provoking book, The Age of Discontinuity, points out the limits of this process. "If we expect gratitude from students, we deserve to be disappointed. If we expect them to conform and to accept the society and the school their elders furnish them, we deprive ourselves of the specific strength of the young, their vision, energy, courage, and imagination. But responsibility -- a keen sense of the moral obligation which their numbers, their privileges and their power entail -- that we can, and will, ask for."

Those of us on the campus task force stressed our belief in the student's responsibility. We emphasized that violence is not a legitimate means of protest or mode of expression. If there is to be orderly progress or redress of legitimate grievances, violence is not a proper means to achieve an end. Responsibility, however, lies not only with those on the campus. I am well aware of the responsibility which Congress bears. One very important part of the relationship between the Congress and the college is that relating to the cost of higher education, since the federal government has now assumed an important share of total higher education costs.

> In fiscal year 1968, the federal government gave a total of 4 billion, 363 million dollars in support of higher education. Of this total, approximately

one third was designated for support of students and another one third for academic research. The remaining third was spent on facilities and equipment, current operations, teacher training, and educational research in that order. The estimated outlays for fiscal year 1969 run to 4 billion, 651 million dollars. With this kind of heavy federal expenditure, we in the Congress would be shirking our duty if we did not cast a critical eye on events in the universities today.

Let us recognize that while the federal investment in education has gone up as has that given by local and state units of government, there are ominous signs that all is not well with education. The taxpayers are restless as seen by the increasing number of bond issues voted down and the reluctance of legislators to increase funds for all levels of education. As Drucker says: "The ambivalence between faith in education and resistance to its costs is present everywhere." It is also important to recognize that there will be increasing competition between levels of education for the limited dollars available.

There has been a tendency to assume that our belief in college as a goal is sufficient to justify almost limitless expenditures without raising questions. This I do not believe will be the case in the future, and I think that higher education will be subject to increasing questioning, just as elementary and secondary education has been in recent years.

These are not just questions related to what kind of aid or emphasis is placed on aid but rather whether the structure of the institution is viable, whether the structure of the course work makes sense, and whether there is a better direct payoff by investing in preschool education, for example, rather than higher education. I raise today briefly a number of questions which I believe deserve consideration. I will not attempt to answer these questions but only to cite for you some issues which I think will pre-occupy legislators both in individual states and on the federal level in the years ahead.

One very critical question which must be asked is, who will police the campus? It is my personal belief that this is not a task for the federal government. Perhaps the most important conclusion of the Congressmen who took part in the 1969 campus tour was that hasty legislative action cutting off funds to entire institutions because of the actions of a minority of students would play directly into the hands of the militants. Legislation which treats innocent and guilty alike inadvertently confirms extremist charges that the "establishment" is repressive and indifferent to citizen needs and concerns.

It is nonetheless necessary, I think, to recognize that the Congress will not accept -- and should not accept -- being totally powerless to affect institutions in which it has such a heavy investment. Stated quite bluntly -- in the view of many Congressmen, some strings must be attached to aid. Those who call for an ever-increasing share of costs to be borne by the federal government should ponder the unappealing question of what restrictions they are willing to accept in return.

I would be less than honest if I did not warn that there are very real dangers if the federal government, by virtue of the aid it gives, should begin to impose "solutions" on the university. Yet it is foolish and dangerous to assume that the government will be content to have no voice at all. What we here must seek to do, then, is strike a proper balance between the university's need for academic freedom and the government's right to play some role, if it is to bear a major financial burden.

Another significant issue which should be raised is the relative emphasis to be given to student aid and institutional aid in designing future federal programs for higher education. Major stress could be placed on aiding students and their families to enable them to pay the cost of going through college. Alternatively, the federal government could emphasize direct aid to institutions of higher learning.

The choice made depends in part on the weight given to different educational objectives. If we should decide, for example, that our major goal should be to improve equality of opportunity for higher education, then student aid is most appropriate. If, on the other hand, we believe that the quality of higher education is suffering because not enough resources per student are available to institutions, then direct aid to the institution may be the most effective remedy.

Still more decisions are necessary after we have decided which type of aid we wish to emphasize. If we decide to stress institutional aid, do we do it through formula grants; through categorical aid for buildings, equipment and similar items; or through cost-of-education allowances tied to student aid?

It is interesting to note that today using the categorical grant system a relatively small number of colleges and universities receive a major share of federal funds. In 1968, for example, 2,174 institutions received federal monies but about 70% of that total went to only 100 schools.

Among available alternatives is the formula grant approach. Formula grants allot each school a sum of money based on some measure of performance or institutional output. Such aid is an administratively effective mechanism for giving institutions large sums of money and it may provide a more stable source of funds because it probably would be less subject to sharp reductions in times of fiscal stringency. There are disadvantages to the formula method, however, most notably that it encourages the status quo. Moreover, the aid cannot be aimed at particular schools to improve their relative position.

Categorical aid, too, has its disadvantages. Institutions may purchase excess amounts of an item and thus distort their spending patterns simply because aid is available for that particular item. Then, too, categorical aid programs often suffer deep cuts when federal money is tight. Some of the drawbacks of this type of aid could be reduced if categorical programs were consolidated for particular items and if the definition of categories were broadened. I believe this should be done.

A third type of institutional aid is a cost-of-education allowance, which grants institutions a sum of money to help defray the cost of educating a student receiving federal aid. Such aid is easy to administer and institutions are free to use the money for any purpose they choose. If the allowances are sufficiently generous, institutions are encouraged to enroll highly qualified graduate students or needy undergraduates.

There are a variety of forms of student aid presently used. In all of them there are continuing problems, particularly in assessing whether the aid ought to be channeled through the college as we do today or given directly to the students. One can argue that the present below cost tuition policy such as now exists in most institutions of higher education, particularly in public institutions, does not equalize the opportunities for low income youth to pursue post secondary education and training.

Professors Hansen and Weisbrod at the University of Wisconsin have offered what they call the Higher Education Opportunity Proposal. The proposal is designed to achieve both an equitable and efficient solution to the problems of financing undergraduate education. Although the proposal might ultimately be feasible at the national level, they view it as immediately applicable at the state level. The proposal has three major elements.

(1) The present financial system of State instructional and capital appropriations directly to the public universities and branch campuses as well as to vocational districts would be abandoned, though only as far as undergraduate education is concerned. Institutions would instead derive most of their operational income by raising undergraduate tuition to more closely approximate the full costs of instruction.

(2) A standard cost figure would be determined. This would recognize that elements other than tuition are included in a student's budget -- especially maintenance expenses, and books and supplies. The tuition-cost component would be related to average full costs at public undergraduate institutions in the state.

(3) The state would then provide supporting grants directly to students, based on the difference between standard cost and their ability to pay. These grants would be made on the basis of financial need, using the need analysis techniques now employed to distribute existing financial aid resources in Wisconsin and elsewhere throughout the nation.

It is interesting to note that in Wisconsin the cost of such grants for 1969-70 would be between 90 and 94 million dollars as contrasted to the present institutional grant program used in Wisconsin of 123.3 million dollars.

Few public institutions look kindly on this kind of freedom of choice plan for students, but I believe we cannot lightly dismiss this alternative. The concept here also relates to another question we must ask. What should be the role of private institutions in higher education?

If we believe that private colleges and universities are a vital part of our total educational scheme, then we must be aware of the economic pressures now burdening private institutions. Current sources of financial support are becoming increasingly inadequate in relation to need. In recent years, such schools as Princeton, Cornell, Yale, Chicago, and Columbia have experienced deficits ranging from one-half million to over two million dollars. Even more significant is the fact that many institutions have avoided deficits only by declining to undertake financial commitments for which there was a serious need. The danger is not that private universities will disappear, but that they will neither be able to meet their current responsibilities nor develop in step with urgent national needs. The real issue now is whether we can devise programs which will take into account the financial needs of all components of our higher educational system without impinging on the freedom of that system.

A further issue which must be considered is that of the role of the community or junior college.

Today there are about 1,000 community colleges, almost double the 1960 count. Virtually every state is now planning to create, expand, or re-organize its public two year college system. With only limited resources available to higher education, we must consider what system or combination of systems will best serve our youth and country as a whole.

U. S. Commissioner of Education James Allen, in a recent address to the National Council of State Directors of Community-Junior Colleges, pointed out a number of distinct advantages to a community college system. The occupational education and manpower training programs, for example, give the college a special link with the economic life of the community. Because the community college accommodates many types of programs, it can experiment with various community-related programs and activities. The community college also promotes another essential goal -- that of redressing educational handicaps of the disadvantaged. Finally, as a crossroads institution tied in with the public school system, with public and private institutions of higher education as well as with industry and other private revenue sources, the community college is the natural proving ground for experiments in educational financing.

We simply must adk ourselves if we are being fair to the young people of this country by our continuing stress on a college education. Given the fact that only about 20% of the high school graduates in America finally graudate from a 4-year college, is the proportion of federal funds expended for higher education out of balance with that which we spend for junior colleges or technical education? At the federal level, we are now spending over $12 for higher education for every $1.00 we spend for vocational education. Shouldn't we ask whether the college bound syndrome is right for the American society?

I will not presume to give you the answer to these questions or to other questions that deal with priorities. But you as specialists in education must decide what kind of program, what kind of orientation, what kind of aid will give the best overall education to the largest number of people to best serve everyone in our society.

Finally, let us refer back to Peter Drucker. He states more succinctly than I can a final point which I would like to leave with you.

Drucker discusses the age old tension between educators and scientists and politicians. Educators complain that politicians fail to budget money for respective disciplines, that they are ignorant of new developments in science, and so forth. Educators only rarely admit their responsibility to enable the politician to function -- to understand the political decisions a new development may require.

Drucker tells us, like it or not, decisions about many education matters are political.

"If need be, we could make the decisions without the scientist's informed and willing participation--though at the certain risk of making many wrong decisions. The scientist, however, cannot possibly make these decisions by himself. They are political decisions, that is, choices between values which are non-scientific and non-factual. Political decisions have to be made by politicians. The decision requires, therefore, a new relationship between the man of knowledge and the decision makers -- and so far, neither of them has given much thought to it.

"Altogether the need to think through and set priorities for knowledge, to direct it, to take risks, moves knowledge, its direction, its goals, and its results, increasingly into politics. We can no longer maintain the traditional line between 'dirty politics' and 'pure knowledge.'"

Drucker admits as do I that, "The men of knowledge will find it hard to accept that the basic decisions on knowledge are political decisions rather than knowledge decisions and therefore not in their hands. They will find it even harder to swallow that we will hold them responsible for these decisions, even though they do not control them." Yet, he says, "The decisions have to be made. The only choice open to the men of knowledge is whether to take part in them responsibly or have them imposed by somebody else."

It is this plea for a new partnership that I leave with you. For those of you who view with gloom involvement in the arena of politics, let me leave a hopeful note. Disraeli once commented, finality is not the language of politics. Believe it or not, politics runs on change. Our task--our joint task--is the wise direction of change. Our task is not only to determine in which direction we go but also to be prepared to accept the responsibility we all have to insure that we are involved in setting the course. That is our job -- not just your job and not just my job. I hope you are willing to share the burden, to direct the change and to work for an improvement in a system that has served so well.